REMARKS

In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests consideration and allowance of the subject application.

Claim Rejections

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 10-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101. Independent claims 10, 17, and 27 have been amended to address the rejection. The remaining claims depend from claims 10, 17, and 27 and incorporate the limitations of these claims. Accordingly, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101 should be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,222,176 to Laurent et al. ("Laurent"). Applicant traverses these rejections.

Laurent cannot anticipate (or render obvious) independent claim 1 because Laurent neither discloses (nor even suggests) limitations recited in independent claim 1. Claim 1 recites in part:

> a plurality of storage cells, at least one storage cell including physical storage media and a storage media controller that controls data transfer operations with the storage media;
> a plurality of host computers configurable to execute write operations to at least one storage cell;
> at least one write control server that regulates the write operations of one or more of the plurality of host computers; and

a communication network that provides communication connections between the storage cells, the host computers, and the write control server.

The Action asserts that Laurent discloses "a plurality of host computers configurable to execute write operations to at least one storage cell, and at least one write control server that regulates the write operations of one or more of the plurality of host computers" as recited in claim 1, and cites column 3, lines 29-40 and column 4, lines 38-48 to support the rejection. Applicants disagree. The cited text reads as follows:

> The present invention solves the foregoing problems by providing a Storage Domain architecture in which a pool of storage devices is controlled by one or a plurality of Storage Domain Servers (SDS). These storage devices may be connected to the Storage Domain Server directly via SCSI enclosures attached to the server, across a private Fiber Channel (FC) network, and/or across a public SAN fabric via switches and hubs. The Storage Domain Server logically maps physical storage data on individual storage devices to logical storage data and presents to each host the storage resources allocated to that host by the storage administrator within the Storage Domain.
>
> By adding Storage Domain Servers to the FC network we have now created a Storage Area Network (SAN) based on Storage Domains; an intelligent, cooperative and scalable technology aimed at solving the crisis of storage. Storage Domain Servers are backbone components to build a SAN architecture through Storage Domains. In place of multiple, incompatible, local storage devices, Storage Domains provided by the invention create a single, compatible, enterprise wide, storage resource pool. In effect, the storage resource pool would appear in the system to be a gigantic shared disk drive.
>
> Contrary to the assertion in the Action, nothing in this text discloses (nor

even suggests) a plurality of host computers configurable to execute write operations to at least one storage cell, and at least one write control server that regulates the write operations of one or more of the plurality of host computers. Rather the cited text discloses storage domain server which logically maps

physical storage data on individual storage devices to logical storage data and presents to each host the storage resources allocated to that host by the storage administrator within the Storage Domain. Accordingly, Laurent cannot anticipate (or render obvious) claim 1. Claims 2-9 depend from claim 1 and are allowable at least by virtue of this dependency.

Claim 10 was rejected on the same basis as claim 1. Applicant traverses the rejection of claim 10 based on the same argument applied to claim 1. Claims 11-16 depend ultimately from claim 8 and are allowable at least by virtue of this dependency.

Claim 17 was rejected on the same basis as claim 1. Applicant traverses the rejection of claim 17 based on the same argument applied to claim 1. Claims 18-26 depend ultimately from claim 15 and are allowable at least by virtue of this dependency.

Claim 22 was rejected on the same basis as claim 1. Applicant traverses the rejection of claim 22 based on the same argument applied to claim 1. Claims 28-33 depend ultimately from claim 27 and are allowable at least by virtue of this dependency.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the present application. Should any issue remain that prevents immediate issuance of the application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss the unresolved issue.

Respectfully Submitted,
Jed W. Caven
Caven & Aghevli LLC
9249 S. Broadway Blvd. #200-201
Highlands Ranch, CO 80129

Dated: July 15, 2009

/Jed W. Caven, Reg. No. 40,551/

Jed W. Caven
Caven & Aghevli LLC
Reg. No. 40,551
(720) 841-9544